



## UCL Academic Manual 2022-23

# Chapter 9: Quality Review Framework

---

Chapter 9 is UCL's regulatory framework for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities across UCL. It includes the regulations for Annual Student Experience Reviews (ASER), Internal Quality Review (IQR) and External Examining as well as Peer Observation of Teaching, Staff-Student Consultative Committees, Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing Committees and Sub-Committees and Academic Committee Review Panels.

1	INTRODUCTION.....	3
2	ANNUAL STUDENT EXPERIENCE REVIEW (ASER).....	5
3	INTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW (IQR) .....	6
4	EXTERNAL EXAMINING .....	7
4.1	Criteria for Appointment .....	7
4.2	Responsibilities of UCL .....	8
4.3	Responsibilities of the External Examiner .....	8
4.4	Nomination and Appointment .....	9
4.5	Student Contact with External Examiners .....	12
4.6	Entitlements of External Examiners.....	12
4.7	External Examiner Reports .....	12
5	PEER DIALOGUE SCHEME.....	14
5.1	What is the Peer Dialogue Scheme?.....	14
5.2	What do I need to do? .....	14
5.3	Option A: Collaborative enhancement of a specific area of practice .....	14
5.4	Option B: Pair-based Teaching Observation .....	15
5.5	Option C: Reflection and dialogue with Student Reviewers .....	15
5.6	Peer Dialogue follow up (Options A, B and C) .....	15
6	STUDENT ACADEMIC REPRESENTATION.....	17
6.1	Introduction .....	17
6.2	Committee Structure and Process.....	17
6.3	Appointment of Representatives .....	17
6.4	Staff Student Consultative Committee Meetings .....	18
6.5	SSCC Terms of Reference.....	19
6.6	Lead Department Representatives.....	20
6.7	Faculty Representatives.....	20
6.8	Faculty Academic Representative Forums.....	20
6.9	Interdepartmental Degree Programmes .....	21
7	STUDENT REPRESENTATION ON UCL ACADEMIC STANDING COMMITTEES AND SUB-COMMITTEES.....	22
7.1	Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level.....	22
7.2	Student Academic Representatives .....	23
7.3	Representation via the Students' Union .....	23
7.4	Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees .....	23
7.5	Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees.....	24
8	ACADEMIC COMMITTEE REVIEW PANEL .....	25
8.1	Policy.....	25
8.2	Procedure.....	25
9	CORE PROGRAMME INFORMATION .....	27
10	MODULE AND PROGRAMME EVALUATIONS POLICY .....	28
10.1	Continuous Module Dialogue .....	28
10.2	Annual Programme Level Evaluations .....	28

# 1 Introduction

1. A risk-based, proportionate, outcome-driven quality and review framework is a vital tool for ensuring the security of academic standards and the quality of learning opportunities for students. UCL's Quality Review Framework integrates all key processes for monitoring standards, the student experience and strategic quality enhancement activities.



## *External Context*

University College London (UCL) is responsible for the standard and quality of the awards made in its name and the quality of the programmes that lead to those awards. Responsibility for developing and delivering programmes is delegated to Departments which all aspire to excellence on taught or research programmes. These aspirations require regular monitoring, review and constructive peer dialogue to provide the necessary assurance, both to the University and to external agencies such as the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and the Office for Students (OfS) about standards and quality.

## *Purpose of the Framework*

The Quality Review Framework should provide assurance to UCL of the following:

- Faculties and Departments have strategic oversight of, and take responsibility for, the academic standards and quality of their programmes, which includes undergraduate, postgraduate taught and graduate research programmes (including professional doctorates).
- All students are treated fairly, equitably and as individuals.
- Students have the opportunity to contribute to shaping their learning experience.
- Students are properly and actively informed at appropriate times of matters relevant to their programmes of study.
- There is sufficient external involvement in the design, approval and review of the curriculum.

- Staff are supported to deliver high quality student experiences.
- Innovation and creativity in the design and delivery of the curriculum is actively supported.

#### *Principles Underpinning the Framework*

The following principles underpin the entire Quality Review Framework:

- Processes for monitoring quality ought to be proportionate to the risk to the student experience and academic standards.
- The framework must ensure that the student interest is being served.
- The framework should respect the academic expertise and administrative professionalism of staff in Departments and faculties.
- Students should be engaged in all elements of the framework.
- Processes must be conducted in a consistent and systematic fashion and be underpinned by robust, high quality data.
- The framework should encourage and promote enhancement and sharing good practice.

## 2 Annual Student Experience Review (ASER)

**Please note:** Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) is being replaced by a process of Departmental Education Planning which is currently in development.

Guidance for the new process will be published in Spring 2023.

### 3 Internal Quality Review (IQR)

**Please note:** Internal Quality Review (IQR) is being replaced by a new risk-based periodic departmental review process which is currently in development.

A Pilot will be conducted in Spring/Summer 2023.

# 4 External Examining

1. External examining provides one of the principal means of maintaining UK academic standards within autonomous higher education providers. External Examining is therefore an important part of UCL's Quality Review Framework (QRF). The following regulations are applicable only to taught programmes of study, including Undergraduate, Initial Teacher Education and Postgraduate.

## 4.1 Criteria for Appointment

1. External Examiners must be appointed for all taught programmes delivered by UCL and academic partner institutions.
2. External Examiners must be competent in assessing students' knowledge and skills at higher education level; expert in the field of study concerned and have appropriate academic and/or professional experience and authority.
3. External Examiners appointed to programmes must meet any specified qualification requirements of the relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.
4. External Examiners must be from outside UCL and must not be involved in teaching on the programme, or be involved in collaborative activity with the staff or students of that programme, for five years before their term of office and during their term of office. This includes Honorary staff members.
5. Former members of UCL staff and former UCL students must not be appointed as External Examiners before a lapse of at least five years. It must also be ensured that all students taught by that former member of staff have left the programme being examined
6. External Examiners should not normally hold more than one other substantive External Examinership in addition to their appointment for UCL.
7. External Examiners should not be appointed to examine a single module unless there is a good reason for doing so.
8. External Examiners for undergraduate Boards of Examiners must be eligible to work in the UK.
9. A member of the academic staff of a College of the University of London other than UCL, or any other external institution with which UCL has service teaching arrangements, may be appointed as an External Examiner. It is imperative that the Board of Examiners at UCL, on which the appointee will serve, so far as can be anticipated, is examining no students from the appointee's college.
10. An External Examiner will not be appointed from a department/division in which a member of UCL staff is serving as an External Examiner. Boards of Examiners must check these details with staff in their Department and with the nominee prior to submitting the nominee's details.
11. Only one External Examiner from the same department/division or Faculty of an institution will be appointed to examine the same programme at any one time.
12. An External Examiner may be appointed from the same department/division or Faculty of an institution only after at least two years have elapsed since the termination of the previous appointment from that department/division or Faculty.
13. Exceptions to the foregoing stipulations may on occasion be permitted, for example, in the case of subjects taught only in a very small number of institutions or subjects with an unusually high number of specialisms. These exceptions must be granted by the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience) or nominee .
14. External Examiners must declare, at the time of appointment, or continuation in appointment, any interest in or connection with any student or staff on the programme for which they are acting as External Examiner whether that interest or connection is personal or professional. If such an interest or connection exists, the External Examiner in question should not be appointed or re-appointed. The Chair of the Board of Examiners is responsible for managing this process and should notify any cases to the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience) or nominee.

15. After serving for a period of four consecutive years, (or five years if an extension to service was approved by the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience) or nominee, an External Examiner is not eligible for re-appointment for a period of five years. The period of service is defined as the period of service as an External Examiner at UCL and not as the period of service as External Examiner to a particular Board of Examiners.

## 4.2 Responsibilities of UCL

1. At the time of nomination Departments and Student & Registry Services should provide the External Examiner with sufficient information to enable him/ her to make an informed decision as to whether or not to accept the appointment.
2. Student & Registry Services issue an appointment email clarifying information on payment of fees and expenses and details of UCL's academic regulations. This appointment email acts as a contract letter for the External Examiner.
3. Departments should ascertain whether or not External Examiners have any access requirements or require any reasonable adjustments in order to carry out their duties, as outlined in UCL's [Equal Opportunity Policy](#).
4. UCL will pay expenses promptly on receipt. The fee will be paid on receipt of the External Examiner's report, provided that it is submitted via Portico within one month of the Board of Examiners meeting.
5. Postgraduate External Examiners are registered at UCL as self-employed and are therefore required to declare their income and payment of any sums owed to the Inland Revenue directly.
6. Departments should take the opportunity to meet new External Examiners either online or in person ahead of their first Board of Examiners, to ensure that this meeting is not the first time at which they meet the generality of academic staff.
7. As a minimum, Departments must provide new and continuing External Examiners with the following information by the start of the academic year:
  - i. The name of departmental/divisional board contact (e.g. Examinations Liaison Officer, or Board Administrator).
  - ii. The date(s) of meetings of Board of Examiners to which the External Examiner is invited (when known).
  - iii. The Terms of Reference, Constitution and Membership of the Board (e.g. number of Internal Examiners and any interdepartmental/ interdivisional involvement).
  - iv. The number and subject area of other External Examiners appointed to the Board.
  - v. The Student Handbook or equivalent, Programme Summary and/ or syllabus information.
  - vi. The programme regulations to be used in determining student Progression, Awarding and Classification.
  - vii. The marking criteria for individual papers (when known).
  - viii. The previous year's External Examiners' report and the departmental response.

## 4.3 Responsibilities of the External Examiner

1. The primary responsibilities of a Taught Programme External Examiner are to approve summative assessment tasks prior to students being assessed and to submit an annual report via Portico, based upon their professional judgement, about the following aspects of the programme(s) they examine:
  - i. Whether the academic standards set for the programme qualifications are appropriate.
  - ii. The extent to which the assessment processes are rigorous, ensure equity of treatment for students and have been fairly conducted within UCL's regulations and guidance.
  - iii. The standards of student performance in the programme, or parts of programmes, which they have been appointed to examine.



- iv. To formally delegate authority to Sub Boards to make decisions on their behalf.
- v. Where appropriate, the comparability of the standards and student achievements with those in some other higher education institutions in the UK.
- vi. Identify comparable practice.

**It is not an External Examiner's responsibility to mark any form of summative assessment.**

- 2. The External Examiner's Report Form requests External Examiners to suggest recommendations based on areas of concern not satisfactorily resolved at the meetings of the Board of Examiners.
- 3. The form must be completed on Portico (UCL's student and assessment record system) within one month of the final meeting of the Board of Examiners so that External Examiner's comments can be taken into account for the next academic session. The External Examiners Reporting procedures are set out in the Regulations for External Examining [Annex 9.4.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#). Payment of the External Examiner's fee is authorised when the report is received via Portico by Student & Registry Services and within the one month timeframe.
- 4. External Examiners should consider the totality of the degree in respect of both the syllabus and examination. The major part of their role should be devoted to modules and the assessment elements which are the main determinants of the degree classification. (In some cases this will not be possible as External Examiners are appointed to examine specific module(s) and not a full programme).
- 5. External Examiners will comment on the appropriateness of new or amended methods of assessment.
- 6. External Examiners will be sent a representative sample of a range of assessments that will enable them to make an informed judgement as to whether the internal marking is of an appropriate standard, consistent and fair to all students.
- 7. External Examiners may be invited to attend oral / practical examinations and assessments as observers.
- 8. External Examiners may recommend to the Board of Examiners changes to the marks already arrived at by the Internal Examiners if these appear to them to be inappropriate. Where significant changes are recommended by External Examiners it is essential for them to see all the assessments for that component of the assessment.
- 9. When reviewing students' assessments External Examiners should comply with data protection regulations, maintaining confidentiality of the content of students' work.
- 10. External Examiners will be sent details of other local responsibilities which may exist for the programme(s) they examine

## 4.4 Nomination and Appointment

### 4.4.1 Process of Nomination

- 1. The Chair of a Board of Examiners will nominate an External Examiner for all or part of a taught programme.
- 2. External Examiners must be appointed before the start of the academic session so that they can approve assessment tasks in good time. Nominees must not be asked to undertake any duties until their appointment is formally approved.
- 3. In making a nomination, the Chair will take account of the appointment criteria specified in [Section 4.1 Criteria for Appointment](#), including confirmation of approval of the nomination from the relevant Chair of the Faculty Board of Examiners and Academic Policy and Quality Assurance (APQA) Team where necessary (i.e. where a conflict of interest is identified).

#### *Further Guidance*

- 1. External Examiners need access to a restricted area of Portico (UCL's student records system) to complete the Portico nomination form. NB -This is particularly important because External Examiners will submit their annual reports to UCL also using an on-line tool constructed for this purpose.

2. Access is gained by Board Teams providing all of the information listed below via the MS nomination form. Please do not email us these details. Please find this form here:

**External Examiner Details MS Nomination Form**

- i. Required information:
- ii. General
  - Eligibility for nomination: confirmation that the nomination meets the Criteria for Appointment (Section 4.1)
  - Reasons for the criteria not being met (if relevant)
  - Nominator (Board Team or Faculty Representative)
- iii. Nominee's details
  - Title
  - Surname
  - Forename
  - Contact email address
  - Home Institution/Company\*
  - Home Faculty\*
  - Home Division/Department\*
- iv. Board of Examiner Details
  - Academic start year
  - Is the nomination for a new BoE?
  - Board Code
  - Board Title
  - Programme Title\*
  - Outgoing External Examiner's UPI
  - Outgoing External Examiner's Name
  - If there is no outgoing External Examiner, the reasons for the nomination
  - If the outgoing External Examiner is terminating early, the reasons for this
  - If the nominee will act on multiple Boards, provide all Board codes

\*This information is required to help the APQA Team check the eligibility criteria has been met.

- v. Please note that if any of the required information is missing Board Teams will be asked to provide it before the nomination can proceed as this data is used to generate the External Examiner Unique Personal Identifier.
- vi. The APQA Team will contact the nominee for the following information:
  - Nominee's Date of Birth (required to set up on UCL Services System)
  - Nominee's home address,
  - Gender
3. The APQA Team will set up the nominee on UCL's Services System.
4. The APQA Team will Appoint the nominee to the relevant Board of Examiners. This generates an email to the nominee, containing a link to the Portico online nomination form.
5. Submission of the online nomination form, generates an In Tray task in Portico for the Chair, Deputy Chair and Administrators of the Board of Examiners. This task is for Board approval of the nomination.
6. Upon checking the details, including for UG External Examiners their Right to Work evidence (see Point 13 below), and being content to proceed with the nomination, the Board approves the nomination.
7. Once Board approval is submitted, an In Tray task in Portico for the Faculty representatives is generated. The Faculty approver can accept or reject the nomination or send queries back to the Chair of the Board.

8. Once Faculty approval is submitted, the nomination is sent to the APQA Team for approval, or otherwise, on behalf of the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience).
9. On approval by the Vice-Provost (Education and Student Experience)'s nominee, the External Examiner is appointed by UCL for a period of 4 years (or less if requested).

#### **Responsibilities of the Board of Examiners**

10. Chairs of Boards should consider the travelling distances involved from a proposed External Examiner's place of residence to UCL, practicalities of travel and the likely costs to UCL in expenses, noting that Student & Registry Services is only able to reimburse up to certain values, and any additional sums will be charged to the relevant department / division. Please refer to the UCL Expenses policy: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/finance/policies-corporate-info/expenses-policy>
11. External Examiners should claim expenses using the UCL General Expense Form (for external visitors) available here: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/finance/spending-money/policies-forms-info/forms-relating-expenditure>. Departments/divisions should ensure that External Examiners make use of this form.
12. The appointment of overseas External Examiners should be limited.
13. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Board of Examiners to verify eligibility of UG External Examiners to work in the UK or to arrange suitable provision, for example a Permitted Paid Engagement letter to enter the UK. The guidance set out on the [UCL Human Resources - Immigration](#) website should be followed.
14. Boards of Examiners should avoid appointing excessive numbers of External Examiners.

#### **4.4.2 Period of Appointment**

1. External Examiners are appointed for a period of four academic years.
2. In exceptional circumstances, External Examiners may have their four-year term extended for one further academic session only, subject to the approval of the Quality Review Sub-Committee. Chairs of Boards of Examiners are responsible for requesting extensions for their External Examiners via submission of the form: [Extension Request for UCL External Examiners](#).
3. If it is decided that an External Examiner will finish their term before the four-year period is completed, the Chair of the Board must formally notify the External Examiner concerned and inform the Chair of Quality Review Sub-Committee of the decision via [examiners@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:examiners@ucl.ac.uk) with a brief statement of reason.

#### **4.4.3 Continuation of Appointment**

1. An External Examiner has the right not to seek continuation in appointment at any time during the period in which they are eligible to serve. See point 4.4.4.2 below for details on early termination of appointment.
2. If an External Examiner interrupts his/her service, the interrupted period does not count when calculating the total period of service. [examiners@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:examiners@ucl.ac.uk) should be informed of any interruption of service before the interruption takes place.

#### **4.4.4 Termination of Appointment**

1. UCL reserves the right not to continue the appointment at any time during the period that the External Examiner is eligible to serve. External Examiners will be formally notified by the Chair of the Board as outlined in Section 4.4.2 Period of Appointment.
2. If the External Examiner wishes to terminate their appointment, this should normally be arranged to take effect at the end of an academic year, but in any case is subject to three months' notice.

## 4.5 Student Contact with External Examiners

1. UCL is required to provide details of its External Examiners, for information only, to students, including the name and institution of the External Examiner.
2. Students must not make direct contact with External Examiners regarding their individual performance in assessments. Appropriate mechanisms are available to raise these concerns through the procedures set out in [Chapter 6, Section 7: Academic Appeals Procedure](#). External Examiners should inform [examiners@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:examiners@ucl.ac.uk) should a student contact them.
3. External Examiners may be given an opportunity to meet students to ascertain their thoughts about the strengths and weaknesses of their educational experience at UCL. This is not something that is routinely offered to External Examiners but can be arranged by the programme / board administrators should the External Examiner wish to meet students.

## 4.6 Entitlements of External Examiners

1. External Examiners are entitled to withhold their approval to decisions of the Board of Examiners under the following circumstances:
  - i) They are in a dispute with those decisions which cannot be resolved at Board of Examiner level.
  - ii) They are not satisfied that the examination procedures have been properly carried out.
  - iii) They perceive serious deficiencies in the examination procedures. In all such exceptional circumstances the matter in question will be referred directly to the UCL Quality Review Sub-Committee.
  - iv) External Examiners have the right to raise matters of serious concern at the highest level of UCL, either with the Chair of Quality Review Sub-Committee or Vice-Provost (Education & Student Experience). When all institutional avenues have been exhausted, External Examiners may contact QAA through its Concerns scheme route.

## 4.7 External Examiner Reports

### 4.7.1 Distribution of Reports and Response to Reports

1. The process for considering External Examiners' reports is set out in the External Examiners' Reporting Process (see [Annex 9.4.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#)).
2. Access to these documents will be provided to students via UCL's student records system, Portico, and should also be discussed at Departmental Staff-Student Consultative Committees.
3. A flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available at [Annex 9.4.2](#).

### 4.7.2 Annual Student Experience Review (ASER)

1. The Annual Student Experience Review process (see [Section 2](#)) is intended to provide an increased level of central data analysis which will flag up statistically significant issues and highlight particularly strong or weak data from a variety of sources. Each Department will respond directly to the issues identified by its own data which will allow for the collation and comparison of meaningful data and reflects a genuinely risk-based approach. The central analysis will also help to identify cross-institutional trends and variances.
2. External Examiners' Reports will be used in conjunction with quantitative data and additional sources, such as external survey results, feedback from internal surveys and employability statistics, to compile the central datasets that will be considered by

### 4.7.3 Monitoring of Reports and Responses

1. Academic Services will monitor responses to all reports. A step by step process for monitoring External Examiners' reports and responses to the reports is set out in [Annex 9.4.1 Main Steps: Response to External Examiners' Reports](#) and a flow chart for the External Examiner Reporting process is available at [Annex 9.4.2](#)). In order to help faculty and departmental internal processes, an optional template to record departmental Chair of Board responses to External Examiners' recommendations is at [Annex 9.4.3](#).
2. External Examiners will be asked to make recommendations within their report and grade these as Essential, Advisable or Desirable, which would require timely responses. The report must make clear whether or not there are, in the Examiners' opinion, any risks to academic standards on the module/programme. If External Examiners are satisfied that no recommendations are required, they should clearly state this in the relevant sections of the report. They are asked not to leave sections blank and to enter 'not applicable'. The definitions for the three categories are as follows:
  - i) **Essential:** Serious areas of concern which, in your opinion, place academic standards and/or the student learning experience at immediate risk and requires action before the start of the next academic year.
  - ii) **Advisable:** Areas of concern regarding threshold standards which, while currently being met, in your opinion, could be significantly improved.
  - iii) **Desirable:** Areas where, in your opinion, there is potential for enhancement.
3. A designated member of academic staff should be available to respond to External Examiners' recommendations within the specified timeframe. The Chairs of Boards of Examiners must ultimately be responsible for drafting a response if the designated academic has conflicting responsibilities.
4. APQA will prepare annual reports on matters of general interest and concern for wider dissemination to Quality Review Sub-Committee.
5. A Department's (or partner institution's) annual main meeting of the Board of Examiners for a programme at which an External Examiner is present should include early in its agenda a copy of the report and the Department's response for the previous year.

# 5 Peer Dialogue Scheme

## Enhancing research-based education at UCL

### 5.1 What is the Peer Dialogue Scheme?

1. The Peer Dialogue scheme is open to all staff who teach and/or support students' learning at UCL. Its aim is to inspire you to develop your teaching and your students' learning, by working closely with colleagues. It enables you to focus on developing a range of dimensions of your practice, such as classroom teaching, feedback on assessment or development of resources. You are invited to engage in a constructive discussion about enhancing student learning and/or the wider student experience in your subject.
2. Peer Dialogue is not a judgmental process, but an opportunity for creative thinking about developing your educational practice. Departments will keep a brief record of engagement with the scheme, to demonstrate commitment to ongoing, collegial enhancement of academic practice. This should record the participants in the engagement, the option followed and the date(s) the activity took place. All UCL staff who teach must participate and Departmental records are to be forwarded to Faculty Teaching Committees.

### 5.2 What do I need to do?

1. You have three options, and can choose which to undertake in each academic year. We recommend using the range of the options over time. Staff on probation should take advice from their subject leader on which option would be the most helpful.

### 5.3 Option A: Collaborative enhancement of a specific area of practice

**Colleagues work in twos, threes or small groups (same subject OR interdisciplinary clusters).**

1. Identify with your Peer Dialogue partner(s) one or more aspects of your educational practice which you would like feedback on, for example: assessment methods; feedback to students; e-learning materials and resources; flipped lectures; inclusive teaching for diverse groups; research-based education. See the [UCL Teaching and Learning Portal](#) for more examples.
2. Plan times to observe each other's educational practice in the area of interest.
3. Spend time on preparation before the session. It will be very helpful if you understand the context of each other's practice and the aim and content of particular activities and/or assessments.
4. When observing, make notes on what you will feed back to your colleague and on what you can apply to your own practice.
5. Engage in a constructive follow-up discussion, exploring how your practice can be mutually enhanced.
6. Write a very brief account (50-150 words) summarising any changes you plan following the Peer Dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others in the department.
7. If the colleagues agree that it would be mutually beneficial, they may wish to extend this option, so that following the discussion and prior to writing the report, they:
  - a) Agree on their approaches to enhancement.
  - b) Try out the new approaches and then get together to review them.

## 5.4 Option B: Pair-based Teaching Observation

1. Identify with a colleague one or more aspects of your face-to-face teaching which you would like feedback on. You are encouraged to select a new partner for the Peer Dialogue each academic year, so that you can draw on and contribute to the expertise of diverse colleagues.
2. Plan times to visit each other's teaching sessions.
3. Spend time on preparation before the session. It will be very helpful if you understand the context of each other's teaching and the aim and content of particular session.
4. When observing, make notes on what you will feed back to your colleague and on what you can apply to your own teaching/course design.
5. Engage in a constructive follow-up discussion, exploring how your practice can be mutually enhanced.
6. Write a brief joint report (50-150 words) summarising any changes you plan following the Peer Dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others in the department.

## 5.5 Option C: Reflection and dialogue with Student Reviewers

**Staff work in partnership with one or two students, who are not taking the course under consideration, to reflect on their educational practice through dialogue as follows:**

1. The staff and student(s) meet to introduce themselves and their motivation for working with each other. They should agree the focus for their joint investigation into the staff member's educational practice and the format of this.
2. The student(s) spends a minimum of 3 hours observing educational practice (such as a combination of observation of online teaching, a Moodle site/other VLE and/or assignment brief/ other course documentation).
3. Prior to each observation the staff and student(s) discuss the context, aim and content of the observation.
4. When observing, the student(s) should make some notes to aid their memory of it. They should spend some time following the observation reflecting on it from their perspective.
5. Following each observation the staff and student(s) should engage in constructive dialogue about their different perspectives on the observation. This will focus on how the teaching practice can be enhanced; what the student has learnt about how to learn effectively and whether this learning can also be shared with course participants to enhance their learning.
6. The student may additionally, with the agreement of the member of staff, discuss the experience of taking the course with course participants, to inform their reflections and feed these insights into the discussion with the member of staff teaching the course. In this case, the focus of the dialogue with course participants should be discussed with the staff member in advance and the outcomes discussed afterwards.
7. The staff and student(s) should collaboratively write a short report (50-150 words) summarizing any changes that are planned following the dialogue, focusing particularly on suggestions of benefit to others (staff and students) in the department.
8. Participants may also wish to add an invitation to present the outcomes of the Peer Dialogue to Staff Student Consultative Committees.

## 5.6 Peer Dialogue follow up (Options A, B and C)

**You are invited to:**

- Present and discuss your account of Peer Dialogue at your appraisal
- Present your enhancement work to your Departmental Teaching Committee

- Share with your Departmental Teaching Committee any generic issues arising, for example suggestions for changes to the use of space or of technology
- Present the outcomes of the Peer Dialogue to Staff Student Consultative Committees
- Develop a case study for the UCL Teaching and Learning Portal: email [ConnectedCurriculum@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:ConnectedCurriculum@ucl.ac.uk) to discuss possibilities
- Lead a UCL Arena exchange seminar, to share your developments with colleagues beyond your Faculty: see [UCL Arena Peer Dialogue](#) or contact [arena@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:arena@ucl.ac.uk).

For further information or guidance on how to engage with the UCL Peer Dialogue scheme, please contact [arena@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:arena@ucl.ac.uk).



# 6 Student Academic Representation

## 6.1 Introduction

1. UCL Regulation for Management 12.1 provides as follows: “In each academic Department [1] there shall be at least one departmental Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC). Each Staff-Student Consultative Committee shall meet regularly in each academic year to enable joint working between staff and students, through discussion and agreement of priorities for improving students’ educational experience.”
2. The purpose of student academic representation is to enable partnership working between students and staff throughout UCL. Through their representatives, the Student Voice should shape and influence the work of their departments, their faculties, and UCL.
3. Arrangements for academic representation are overseen by the Quality Review Sub-Committee (QRSC), with membership from UCL departments, faculties, professional services, and the Students’ Union. The QRSC reports to and Education Committee.
4. Academic representation at UCL is conducted in partnership with the Students’ Union, who shall:
  - i) Ensure effective promotion of representative roles together with faculties and departments. Provide induction training for representatives, and further opportunities which support them in their role.
  - ii) Ensure information is available to students and staff on who holds representative positions, and to provide contact information where appropriate.
  - iii) To provide guidance for both students and staff, including relevant information, support, and examples of best practice.

## 6.2 Committee Structure and Process

1. Each Department shall normally have one SSCC. A Department may wish to establish a separate SSCC for postgraduate or research students where the membership of the Departmental SSCC would otherwise be too large.
2. Meetings with representatives at a programme level, though encouraged, do not constitute SSCC meetings, except in the case of inter-departmental programmes (see 6.9). Departments should avoid complex SSCC structures that disperse the Student Voice.
3. The minutes of SSCC meetings and feedback from representatives should be a standing item for discussion on the agenda of the Department’s Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent).
4. The Department should ensure that its calendar of committee meetings facilitates timely discussion of issues raised by SSCCs.

## 6.3 Appointment of Representatives

1. Departments should appoint representatives for each of the following:
  - i) At least one representative for each year-group in each taught programme of study. Where appropriate, each representative may instead be appointed to represent a linked cluster of taught programmes.
  - ii) At least one representative for early years research students (students in their first or second years) and for later years research students (students in their third year or beyond), or the equivalent periods for part-time research students.
  - iii) For programmes offered on a part-time basis, there should be at least one part-time representative for the programme.
2. Programmes with large year groups should consider appointing more than one representative per year group. Departments with a small number of programmes should consider appointing representatives for different pathways or specialisms within that programme.

3. All representatives should be members of an SSCC; the role should not be split between multiple students, nor should different representatives be invited to attend different meetings of the same SSCC.
4. All representatives should normally be appointed by process of election, except where this is not possible or there is insufficient interest in the role. Elections should include a 'Re-Open Nominations' (RON) option to encourage and support the accountability of representatives to the students they represent.
5. The appointment of representatives should be completed by the close of the October appointment schedule which is agreed and circulated by the QRSC in advance of each academic session. The details of representatives should be reported to the Students' Union via the designated contact in the Faculty.
6. Should a representative step down during their term of office prior to the term two reading week, the representative should be replaced by any method approved by the SSCC Co-Chairs.
7. The SSCC may choose to co-opt additional representatives to ensure a diverse membership that can effectively reflect students' views and perspectives.
8. Any co-opted or replacement representative's details should be reported to the Students' Union via the Faculty in the same manner as during appointment of the Student Academic Representatives in October.
9. All departments should take steps to ensure their representatives attend training arranged by the Students' Union as part of taking up their role.
10. The term of office for each representative is 12 months from the date of their appointment in October, or the end of their studies, whichever is sooner. At the close of each students' term of office, the role should be re-elected.
11. Any representative appointed at a later date through replacement or co-option will also end their term of office in October. SSCC meetings in advance of the October appointment of representatives may utilise the returning membership of the SSCC.

## 6.4 Staff Student Consultative Committee Meetings

1. SSCC membership in each department will be set following consultation between students and departmental staff but must include the following:
  - i) Head of Department (or Deputy)/Programme Director/Senior member of academic staff
  - ii) At least one member of staff responsible for undergraduate students
  - iii) At least one member of staff responsible for taught Masters students\*
  - iv) At least one member of staff responsible for research students\*
  - v) All student academic representatives in the department
  - vi) Where relevant, a committee member of an academic society based in the department

\* May not be required where there is a separate committee graduate or research-student SSCC.

2. Each SSCC will have joint Co-Chairs, one student and one staff member, who are responsible for agreeing each meeting's agenda. The student Co-Chair should be the Lead Department Representative, who will be appointed by a process specified by the Students' Union .
3. Departments will nominate a member of professional service staff responsible for each SSCC, who will act as secretary. SSCC minutes should clearly indicate who has attended, and their role in relation to the Committee.
4. Staff membership of the SSCC should not form a majority.
5. An SSCC should meet a minimum of at least three times in each academic year (typically once per term). The Co-Chairs will be responsible for assessing whether further meetings would be useful. Some or all members may participate in the meeting through a UCL supported online platform such as Moodle, Blackboard Collaborate or MS Teams, where they cannot physically be in attendance.
6. The agenda shall be circulated to all SSCC members normally at least one week before the date of a meeting of a Committee. The agenda should also be made

available to all students via a Department webpage, Moodle or any other appropriate method.

7. Where the Co-Chairs agree, the agenda points in 6.5 can be adapted to suit any SSCCs that have more specific needs, particularly postgraduate SSCCs.
8. The unconfirmed minutes of an SSCC meeting, as approved by the Co-Chairs, should be displayed to all students via a Department webpage, Moodle or any other appropriate method within ten working days of the meeting. These minutes should also be emailed to [sscc@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:sscc@ucl.ac.uk) within this timeframe.
9. A template for the SSCC agenda and minutes is available at Annex 9.6.1.

## 6.5 SSCC Terms of Reference

1. To act as a focal point of student engagement and partnership in the Department, bringing staff and students together to celebrate successes, to reflect on challenges, and to jointly identify priorities for change in the future.
2. To report on priorities and agreed actions to the Department Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent), and to make recommendations where appropriate.
3. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at every meeting, focusing on:
  - a) Any areas of concern raised by the Student Representatives or other SSCC members, not otherwise covered by the below
  - b) The Annual Student Experience Review (ASER) Development and Enhancement Plan:
    - i. Teaching and Curriculum
    - ii. Assessment and Feedback
    - iii. Academic Support – including personal tutoring
    - iv. Organisation and Management - including timetabling and Departmental processes
    - v. Learning Resources - including library, IT and other teaching/learning resources
    - vi. Learning Community
    - vii. Student Voice
    - viii. Continuation and Outcomes
    - ix. Inclusivity
    - x. Careers and Employability
    - xi. Other

Note: the ASER themes and data may be separated for discussion at different SSCC meetings.

  - c) UCL ChangeMakers Projects including discussion of project proposals and tracking of progress of the projects throughout the year
4. To ensure joint student and staff discussion at least once during every Academic Session of:
  - a) Information relating to internal and external systems of accountability, to include Professional, statutory and regulatory body reports and Department responses to recommendations
  - b) New and revised programme developments
  - c) As part of the ASER discussions, to ensure the SSCC reviews and discusses the following key information and data at least once during the session:
    - i. Results and actions arising from relevant student surveys e.g. Module surveys, New to UCL, National Student Survey (NSS), Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey (PTES), Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PRES)
    - ii. External examiners' reports and Department responses to recommendations
    - iii. Careers data
  - d) Other student-led projects or events, such as those led by student societies
  - e) The effectiveness of the SSCC and the actions of the Students' Union and Departments in response to it

- f) The priorities and actions of the Department Teaching Committee (and/or research-education equivalent)
  - g) Opportunity for the Lead Department Representative to report on meetings they have attended at the Faculty level
  - h) The development of strategies to support research students' experiences
5. To facilitate greater communication between students and staff, and report key actions, discussions and recommendations to the wider student body.
  6. To identify and disseminate examples of good practice.
  7. To enable the engagement of students through their representatives with processes to enhance students' experiences, such as ASER (see Term of Reference 3 above).

## 6.6 Lead Department Representatives

1. The Department will be responsible for the appointment of the Lead Department Representative through a process specified by the Students' Union.
2. The Lead Department Representative(s) will be responsible for leadership of the SSCC, ensuring the effectiveness of students' voices in influencing and shaping their learning experiences.
3. The Lead Department Representative(s) should be invited to join their Departmental Teaching Committee (and/or doctoral-education equivalent). Other student representatives may also be invited where appropriate.
4. Where appropriate, the Lead Department Representative can be called upon to attend departmental and Faculty meetings to represent the SSCC. They can also take chair's action to approve changes to policies and documents that require action before an SSCC can be convened. Where such action is taken, the Lead Department Representative must be allowed time to consult with the SSCC to gain wider student feedback and the chair should provide a full report to the next formal SSCC meeting.
5. Any Faculty with only one Department is not required to appoint a Lead Department Representative. For such faculties, the duties of the Lead Department Representative should be carried out by the Faculty Representative(s).

## 6.7 Faculty Representatives

1. The Students' Union will be responsible for the election of Faculty Representatives for each Faculty.
2. The Faculty Representative(s) will be responsible for the leadership of representatives in the Faculty, ensuring the effectiveness of students' voices in influencing and shaping their departments. They will also represent their Faculty in institution-wide forums and the Students' Union.
3. The Faculty Representative(s) should be invited to join their Faculty Teaching Committee (or doctoral-education equivalent). Other student representatives may also be invited where appropriate.

## 6.8 Faculty Academic Representative Forums

1. Each faculty should operate a forum which brings together faculty staff, Faculty representatives, and the Lead Department Representatives (or their nominee) from each SSCC in the faculty.
2. The purpose of this forum will be to identify shared priorities within the faculty and any action required to address such priorities, and to involve students with faculty decision-making. The Faculty Teaching Committee, Faculty Research Degrees Committee and/or the Faculty Representatives may additionally wish to utilise the forum as a sounding board where they identify a need for greater student involvement with particular matters.
3. A staff lead for the forum should be established, who should be a member of the Faculty Teaching Committee and/or the Faculty Research Degrees Committee. The staff lead and the Faculty Representatives will be responsible for agreeing the agenda and format of each meeting.

4. This forum should meet at least twice each year.
5. Faculties may wish to operate more than one forum to cover different levels of study.
6. The format of this forum is not required to be a committee meeting, and creative approaches to considering business are encouraged, i.e. workshop-style items.
7. A record of each meeting should be taken and circulated to attendees. This may be in the form of summary notes rather than formal minutes.

## 6.9 Interdepartmental Degree Programmes

1. Degree programmes that are inter-departmental (with contributions from more than two Departments) are required to have a separate, programme-based, SSCC. UCL's Regulations for Management 12.2 and 12.3 provide as follows:
  - 12.2 Subject to the provisions of Regulation 12.3 below, there shall be, for each combined studies degree programme operating within UCL and involving more than two Departments of UCL, an SSCC, which shall meet regularly in each academic year.
  - 12.3 Where the academic staff responsible for the co-ordination of a combined studies degree programme operating within UCL and involving more than two Departments of UCL consider that it will not be appropriate for a separate Staff-Student Consultative Committee to operate for the degree programme in question, those staff shall ensure that the views of students following the programme can be expressed instead either through (i) the Staff-Student Consultative Committees of the Departments concerned, as prescribed in Regulation 12.1, or through (ii) an annual meeting which all students following the programme shall be invited to attend, or through both (i) and (ii).

# 7 Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing Committees and Sub-Committees

## Policy

1. UCL and the Students' Union provide many opportunities for students to engage with UCL's policy- and decision-making in all areas of teaching, learning and support. Students can have a say in the way the University is run. There are many opportunities. The page below summarises these.

## 7.1 Representation at Departmental and Faculty Level

### 7.1.1 Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC)

1. Every Department should have at least one Staff-Student Consultative Committee (SSCC) (see Section 6) which meets at least three times each academic session (typically once each term). SSCCs provide the opportunity to feedback to lecturers and departmental administrators about issues that have impacted on programmes and modules. These may include good or bad ways in which lectures, tutorials, labs etc. have been delivered which can be addressed by the teaching Department, or they may include university-wide issues such as library or computing facilities, or even noise caused by building works. Departments take these comments very seriously, and the minutes of the SSCC meetings are considered by the UCL Student Experience Committee (see Section 7.4).

### 7.1.2 Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC)

1. Every Department should hold a Departmental Teaching Committee (DTC) meeting each term, where changes in programmes, modules, teaching and assessment are agreed and monitored. All DTCs should invite the student Lead Department Representative to membership of the Committee (see Section 6.6) and consider inviting other student representatives where appropriate.

### 7.1.3 Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC)

1. All of UCL's academic Departments belong to a Faculty which provides governance and support to the way in which Departments are managed. All Faculties have a Faculty Teaching Committee (FTC) which meets termly. All FTCs should invite the student Faculty Representative to membership of the Committee (see Section 6.7) and consider inviting other student representatives where appropriate.

### 7.1.4 Faculty Research Degrees Committees (FRDC)

1. Faculties may also hold a Faculty Research Degrees Committee (FRDC) meeting each term. The FRDC should include three Research Student Representatives in its membership and attendance may rotate depending on availability for meetings. The FRDC may also wish to invite the student Faculty Representative to its meetings.

### 7.1.5 Faculty Academic Representative Forums

1. Faculties should also hold a Faculty Academic Representative forum. The forum should include Faculty Representatives and the Lead Department Representatives (or their nominee) from each SSCC in the faculty.

### 7.1.6 Further Information

1. For more information on your SSCC, DTC, FTC, FRDC or Faculty Academic Representative forum, students should contact their undergraduate or postgraduate tutor or the Faculty Office.

## 7.2 Student Academic Representatives

1. Student Academic Representatives are elected to represent students' views to UCL. Student Academic Representatives sit on various committees at a programme (such as SSCCs), faculty and university level, at which they act as the voice of students, ensuring that UCL takes into account the needs of students in its decision-making processes. The Student Academic Representative scheme is managed by the Students' Union, and students can be representatives at both a departmental and faculty level. For general enquiries, please visit the Students' Union website.

## 7.3 Representation via the Students' Union

1. The Students' Union is run by students for students. Apart from providing social spaces, support services and extra-curricular activities, the Students' Union is an important political forum for all students. Students at UCL are automatically members of the Students' Union and have access to all its facilities and support. The Students' Union is run by Student Officers who are elected each year by the membership. Students can speak to one of these officers if they have any issues with which Officers may be able to aid or support them.

## 7.4 Student Representation on UCL Academic Standing and Sub-Committees

1. Many of UCL's formal committees have student representation. On most of these committees, the student representatives comprise one or more of the Students' Union's elected Student Sabbatical Officers, who you may speak to if there are issues that you wish to raise at meetings of these committees.
2. The Student Experience Committee (StEC) deals with issues relating directly to students. It reviews university-wide issues raised at SSCCs and also looks at the data received from student surveys. Many of the agenda items are raised by students via the Students' Union. StEC currently has eleven student members and three student sabbatical officers. These student members are nominated by the Students' Union. If you are interested in being nominated to serve on StEC, then please contact Simon To, Representation & Campaigns Manager, Students' Union: [simon.to@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:simon.to@ucl.ac.uk).
3. Current student representation on UCL's formal academic committees is as follows:

### **Academic Board**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Thirteen elected full-time students, including at least one from each Faculty, with the proportion of undergraduate and postgraduate students determined to reflect the overall student population.

### **Academic Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Welfare & International Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

### **Education Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Welfare & International Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- One taught graduate student, nominated by the Students' Union
- One undergraduate student, nominated by the Students' Union

### **Library Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

### **Research Degrees Committee**

- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- One research student, nominated by the Students' Union

### **Student Experience Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Welfare & International Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Eleven student members with one from each faculty nominated by the Students' Union

### **Student Recruitment, Admissions and Funding Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

## **7.5 Student Representation on UCL Non-Academic and Statutory Committees**

### **Council**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)
- Democracy, Operations & Community Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

### **Finance Committee**

- Democracy, Operations & Community Officer, Students' Union (Student Observer)

### **Health and Safety Committee**

- Two Student Observers, nominated by the Students' Union

### **Honorary Degrees and Fellowships Committee**

- Education Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

### **Research Governance Committee**

- Postgraduate Students' Officer, Students' Union (ex officio)

### **Discipline Committee**

- One student, registered at UCL, nominated by the Students' Union (normally as and when the Committee needs to be convened)

### **Discipline Review Body**

- A registered student of another university institution within the University of London, to be appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Registrar of UCL, as and when the Review Body needs to be convened.



# 8 Academic Committee Review Panel

## 8.1 Policy

1. All UCL academic units are required to operate within, and to deliver their programmes in accordance with, UCL's established academic regulatory and procedural frameworks. UCL has in place a number of quality assurance processes to monitor that this is the case and which are designed to identify and resolve any problems which might arise.
2. However, from time to time there may arise an academic quality assurance-related problem within an academic unit or academic programme, which, due to the urgent or serious nature of the problem, cannot be dealt with, or fully resolved, by applying UCL's standard quality assurance processes. In those exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Academic Committee may establish an Academic Committee Review Panel to conduct a special investigation of the academic unit/programme concerned. The purpose of the special investigation will be for the Review Panel to ascertain the nature and extent of the problem, and to recommend to the Chair of the Academic Committee on what further action should be taken to resolve the problem.
3. In all such cases, the following procedure is followed.

## 8.2 Procedure

1. Details of any case which might merit investigation by an Academic Committee Review Panel should, in the first instance, be submitted to, and discussed with, the Secretary to the Academic Committee. The Secretary, on behalf of the Chair of Academic Committee, will ascertain whether UCL's standard quality assurance processes have been exhausted or whether the nature of the problem is such that it cannot be addressed within the scope of those standard processes. Once this preliminary discussion has taken place, the Secretary to the Academic Committee will forward the details of the case to the Chair of the Academic Committee, who will decide whether to establish a Review Panel.
2. If the Chair of the Academic Committee decides to establish a Review Panel, it will comprise:
  - Two members of Academic Committee, including at least one Faculty Tutor, who are not members of staff of the Faculty in which the academic unit or programme concerned is based; one of whom will be appointed as Chair of the Review Panel.
  - A senior member of academic or administrative staff, who is not a Faculty Tutor.
3. The meeting(s) of the Review Panel will be attended by an administrative secretary, normally a member of Academic Services staff nominated by the Director of Academic Services, Student & Registry Services, who will take notes of meeting(s) and assist the Review Panel in the preparation of its report. The Review Panel will normally be expected to complete its work within eight working weeks.
4. The Chair of the Academic Committee will inform the academic unit or programme concerned why a Review Panel has been established and that the Review Panel will wish to conduct discussions with relevant staff and/or students.
5. In conducting its review, the Review Panel may request from the academic unit or programme concerned all such documentation and may meet with whichever staff and students as it deems necessary. UCL staff are expected to cooperate fully with the Review Panel at all times.
6. The Review Panel will meet at least once:
  - To consider the relevant documentation
  - To interview appropriate persons
  - To prepare its report.

7. The Review Panel's provisional report will be sent to the Head of Department or other person responsible for the academic unit or programme concerned. That person will be entitled to notify normally within five working days necessary factual corrections to the report but will not be entitled otherwise to take issue with its findings and recommendations (except where the Head of Department or other person concerned claims that these findings and recommendations are based on factual error).
8. The Review Panel's final report and recommendations will be sent, via the Secretary to the Academic Committee, to the Chair of Academic Committee. A copy will be sent to the Head of Department or other person concerned for information. The Chair of Academic Committee will decide what, if any, further action is necessary in the matter.
9. The Chair of the Academic Committee will report to the Academic Committee that a Review has taken place according to the required procedure and may, if he/she thinks it appropriate, report to the Academic Committee further details of the Review.
10. The recommendations of the Review Panel will indicate what follow-up action is expected on the part of the academic unit or programme concerned and within what period. The academic unit or programme concerned will, in consultation with the Review Panel, produce a written plan detailing the follow-up action that it will take in response to the recommendations for approval by the Chair of the Academic Committee.
11. The Chair of the Review Panel will check with the academic unit or programme concerned in due course that such follow-up action has been taken and will advise the Chair of the Academic Committee as necessary.

# 9 Core Programme Information

The Standard Text for the Core Programme Information can be found on the UCL Academic Manual website, in Chapter 9: Quality Review Framework.

1. The Core Programme Information (CPI) should be provided to all current UCL Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate students (including MRes students).
2. The CPI should be included in a single location such as a student handbook, Moodle site, website or intranet.
3. The CPI represents the minimum information that should be provided to all students. As such, programmes are encouraged to add local information where appropriate.
4. Programmes are free to change the formatting, numbering and order of items, but, where marked 'Centrally Provided' the text itself must be included in its current form. However, departments may change specific terminology to reflect local practice (e.g., 'Programme Director' for 'Programme Leader').

# 10 Module and Programme Evaluations Policy

## 10.1 Continuous Module Dialogue

1. A continuous module dialogue process should take place throughout the running of all taught modules. The purpose of this is to encourage regular dialogue between staff and students, thereby ensuring the student voice is heard, misunderstandings are clarified, and staff are able to make any required changes or reinforce information before the module ends.
2. The dialogue process should take place no fewer than 3-4 times per term between the start and end of the module. This should replace any end of module evaluations (MEQs) unless there are any additional external accrediting body requirements.
3. The dialogue should be initiated by asking students a small number of questions in a pulse survey within a synchronous session, initially focusing on the key areas of teaching, resources and assessment information (suggested questions are provided in the guidance) and then discussing the results. The results will be available in real time and will be the prompt for staff-student dialogue in that or the following session.
4. It is recommended that staff use [Mentimeter](#) to poll students, and staff can adapt the focus of questions as the module progresses and the outcomes from the dialogue process become clear.
5. There is no requirement to report the results of the pulse surveys beyond the module, but staff should use the results to engage in a dialogue with students so that changes can be made or a rationale given if a change is not appropriate.
6. Departments (or faculties, where appropriate) are responsible for capturing that a module dialogue process has taken place and any resulting changes. Responsibility for delivering the module dialogue process rests with the department and there are no central reporting requirements, however it is recommended that the Continuous Module Dialogue Capture survey template (provided in the guidance and tools) is disseminated by the department to Module Leaders and this information is used to complete the Departmental Summary Form (Annex 9.10.1).

## 10.2 Annual Programme Level Evaluations

1. All taught students will be given the opportunity to reflect on their programme as a whole and provide feedback on their experience at key points during their time at UCL through the following surveys:
  - New to UCL (all new students)
  - Annual Programme Evaluation (APE) for all continuing undergraduate students and postgraduate taught students
  - National Student Surveys (NSS) for undergraduate finalists
  - PGT NSS for all postgraduates
2. Annual programme evaluations (APE) will be managed and analysed centrally and will replace any existing locally managed programme surveys, except where these are required for external compliance.
3. As part of APE, students will be able to see a list of the modules they have taken and will be given the opportunity to reflect on the programme as a whole as well as any particular modules they wish to highlight through a free text response.

4. Departments will be asked to support central efforts to collate all programme level evaluations by reminding students to complete surveys and including links to summaries of changes made in response to previous feedback.
5. Evaluation results will be analysed by the central team and then disseminated back to departments for discussion and circulation as per the existing process for NSS and New to UCL.
6. Each department must have in place mechanisms for closing the feedback loop, whereby students are informed of any actions which have been taken in response to the programme evaluation. Whilst the final responsibility for this rests with the department, it is recommended that the closing the feedback loop guidance should be followed to ensure the ongoing feedback cycle is supported.